

REMARKS

Applicants have the following response to the pending Office Action. Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-18 and 52-54

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-18 and 52-54 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masuda et al. (US 6,107,983) in view of Aoki et al. (US 4,644,338 - a new reference). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 of the present application specifically recite that in the claimed device, all the semiconductor elements are n-channel type semiconductor elements. As Applicants explain in depth in the specification, Applicants have discovered that it is particularly advantageous and effective to have a light-emitting device formed of all the semiconductor elements being n-channel type semiconductor elements. The Examiner's attention is particularly directed to page 4, ln. 10 - page 6, ln. 1; page 6, lns. 13-18; page 10, lns. 13-17; and page 21, lns. 1-10 of the specification of the claimed application as examples of the advantages of the present invention. As previously explained, Applicants are unaware of any prior art reference that show a light-emitting device with the claimed elements in which all the semiconductor elements are n-channel type semiconductor elements.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references disclose or suggest that all the semiconductor elements are n-channel type semiconductor elements.

For example, in the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Masuda does not disclose that all the semiconductor elements are n-channel type semiconductor elements, as in independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 of the present application.

While the Examiner also cites Aoki, the Examiner states that Aoki discloses “Aoki on the other hand teaches a liquid crystal display systems shown in Fig. 5 in which the peripheral circuits for driving the semiconductor driver elements are formed on the surface of the substrate on which the thin-film transistors 6R, 6G, 6B for driving the liquid crystal are fabricated. More specifically, Aoki teaches the latch circuit 26 serving as the column driver and the shift register 29 are fabricated as integrated circuits on the substrate 12, and the gate line selector and driver circuit 32 is fabricated as an integrated circuit on the substrate. Aoki shows that the peripheral circuits 26, 29, 32 can be formed simultaneously with the thin-film transistors 6R, 6G, 6B on the substrate 12 without having to increase the number of fabrication steps required (col. 7, lines 29-51).”

It appears that Aoki merely discloses a TFT in a display portion and a TFT in a driver circuit are formed in the same step. There appears to be no disclosure or suggestion in Aoki that all the semiconductor elements in the display portion and the driver circuit are n-channel type semiconductor elements, nor has there been any showing in the Office Action as to where this claimed feature is allegedly shown in the cited references.

Therefore, even if the references are properly combinable (which Applicants do not admit), even if combined, the combination still fails to disclose or suggest a light emitting device in which all the semiconductor elements are n-channel semiconductor elements (i.e. no reference teaches that all the semiconductor elements are n-channel semiconductor elements).

Further, independent Claim 7 also recites that the display portion comprises a switching element and a current control element. Neither Masuda nor Aoki appear to disclose or suggest a

current control element, and there has been no showing in the Office Action as to where this feature is allegedly shown in the cited references.

Hence, the Examiner has not still not produced a prima facie case of obviousness as there has been no showing of a reference or teaching that shows the above claimed features. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-18 and 52-54 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and these claims are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 19-21, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-37, 40-41, 43-51 and 55-69

The Examiner also rejects Claims 19-21, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-37, 40-41, 43-51 and 55-69 under 35 USC §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda in view of Aoki and Tsutsumi et al. (US 6,713,748). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, these claims are also patentable over the cited references and the rejection of these claims is improper.

Further, Tsutsumi is directed to an image detection device, while Masuda and Aoki are directed to liquid crystal displays. Applicants respectfully submit that there would have been no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine Tsutsumi with Masuda and Aoki since these references are directed to different technical fields.

In addition, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending dependent Claims 61 and 63-69 to recite that “each of said plurality of pixels comprises a switching element, a current control element for controlling an amount of current to the light-emitting element, and a capacitor. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest this feature.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 19-21, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-37, 40-41, 43-51 and 55-69 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and the claims are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should now be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: November 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568